UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,112	03/12/2004	Yuxiang May Wang	008245/DSM/BCVD	8920

44257 7590 11/27/2006

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD, SUITE 1500
HOUSTON, TX 77056

EXAMINER	
ANGADI, MAKI A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1765	

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,112	WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maki A. Angadi	1765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-9 and 11-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-9 and 11-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 March 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/10/04, 8/1/05, 11/14/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Reopening of Prosecution After Applied Brief

In view of the appeal brief filed on 9/11/2006, prosecution is hereby reopened. A new ground of rejection is set forth below. Applicants' arguments with respect to the secondary reference of Yang (US Pub. No. 2003/0003771) that fails to teach the formation of amorphous carbon layer using dual frequency are persuasive. As a result, the reference is withdrawn and a new ground of rejection is presented below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1, 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakshina-Murthy et al. (US 6,884,733) in view of Godet, *Jounal of Applied Physics, Vol.84, 3919, (1998)* and Park (US Pub.No. 2004/0224241).

As to claim 1, Dakshina-Murthy discloses use of amorphous carbon hard mask for gate patterning, the method comprises forming a conductive material layer (50) on a surface of the substrate (column 4, lines 53-64), depositing an amorphous carbon layer (60) on the conductive material layer (column 5, line 42) by a method comprising: introducing into the processing chamber one or more hydrocarbon compounds having the general formula CxHy such as Ethylene or propylene (column 5, line 48). And generating a plasma of the one or more hydrocarbon compounds (column 5, line 49), etching the amorphous carbon layer to form a patterned amorphous carbon layer (figure 8); and etching feature definitions in the conductive material layer corresponding to the patterned amorphous carbon layer (figure 9).

Dakshina-Murthy fails to disclose a dual-frequency plasma for the PECVD deposition. However, Godet describes a process where a dual-frequency plasma is used for deposition of an amorphous carbon layer using Ar-H_2 or Ar-He gas mixtures (pages 3920-3921). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to use the dual-frequency method of Godet for forming the amorphous carbon layer because Godet teaches dual-frequency is conventionally used for amorphous carbon layer deposition. One of ordinary skill

in the art would have been motivated to use a dual-frequency deposition method in order to obtain a high-quality dense deposit yielding a compact structure (page 3391, col.1, paragraph 2), which is attributed to the increasing energy of the impinging ion during film growth.

Dakshina-Murthy, fails to disclose an aluminum or aluminum alloy for the conductive gate material (50). The reference of Park discloses aluminum alloys are conventionally used as gate conductors (page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to use the aluminum alloy gate conductor of Park because Park discloses aluminum alloys are conventionally used as gate conductors. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use an aluminum alloy as the gate conductor instead of polysilicon in order to reduce signal delay due to the low resistivity of the material. The amorphous carbon layer will still be used as a mask.

As to claim 4, Dakshina-Murthy discloses hydrocarbon compounds such as ethylene, propylene, methane and the like (col.5, lines 48)

As claim 5, Dakshina-Murthy discloses inert ions may be introduced into the amorphous carbon layer (column 6, line 33). One of ordinary skill in the art would also know that inert gases are conventionally used for diluting gases in plasma, which is a way of introducing inert ions during deposition.

As claim 7, Dakshina-Murthy discloses "One advantageous feature of providing amorphous carbon layer 60 that may be produced with various

thicknesses is that amorphous carbon layer 60 may be produced in a thickness suitable for patterning layer of conductive or semiconductive material 50. For example, where a particular thickness of polysilicon is provided, the thickness of amorphous carbon layer 60 may be altered so that the proper amount of mask material is provided over the polysilicon material to compensate for the etch selectivities of the materials used. This allows for increased manufacturing efficiency by eliminating unnecessary material use" (column 5, line 64) which means one of ordinary skill in the art could select the desired selectivity.

As to claim 8, Dakshina-Murthy discloses an ARC layer (70) (column 7, line 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 3 and 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakshina-Murthy et al. (US 6,884,733) in view of Godet, *Jounal of Applied Physics, Vol.84, 3919, (1998)* and Park et al. (US 2004/0224241) applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Yang (Pub. No. 2003/0003771).

Dakshina-Murthy fails to disclose a dual-frequency plasma for the PECVD deposition. However, Yang discloses a dual frequency that includes high frequency of 200 Watts at 13.56 MHz and a low frequency of 200 Watts and 500KHz (paragraph 0016). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to use the frequencies and power levels as described above because Yang illustrates the use proven deposition conditions

disclosed in the literature in order to obtain a reliable product while reducing costly process development time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 9, 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakshina-Murthy et al. (US 6,884,733) in view of Godet, *Jounal of Applied Physics, Vol.84, 3919, (1998)* and Park et al. (US 2004/0224241).

Dakshina-Murthy discloses use of amorphous carbon hard mask for gate patterning, the method comprises forming a conductive material layer (50) on a surface of the substrate (column 4, lines 53-64), depositing an amorphous carbon layer (60) on the conductive material layer (column 5, line 42) by a method comprising: introducing into the processing chamber one or more hydrocarbon compounds having the general formula CxHy such as Ethylene or propylene (column 5, line 48). And generating a plasma of the one or more hydrocarbon compounds (column 5, line 49) depositing an anti-reflective coating (70) on the amorphous carbon hard mask (figure 5) depositing a patterned resist material (80) on the anti-reflective coating, etching the anti-reflective coating and amorphous carbon hardmask to the conductive material layer (figure 8), and etching feature definitions in the conductive material layer (figure 9).

Dakshina-Murthy, fails to disclose a dual-frequency plasma for the PECVD deposition. However, Godet discloses surface wave coupled microwave MW at 2.45 GHz and capacitively coupled RF at 13.56 MHz for the deposition plasma

(page 3920, paragraph 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to use the frequencies and power levels as described above because those condition are disclosed by Godet. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use proven deposition conditions disclosed in the literature in order to obtain a reliable product while reducing costly process development time.

Dakshina-Murthy, fails to disclose an aluminum or aluminum alloy for the conductive gate material (50). The reference of Park discloses aluminum alloys are conventionally used as gate conductors (page 1, paragraph 0006). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to use the aluminum alloy gate conductor of Park because Park discloses aluminum alloys are conventionally used as gate conductors. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use an aluminum alloy as the gate conductor instead of polysilicon in order to reduce signal delay due to the low resistivity of the material. The amorphous carbon layer will still be used as a mask.

As to claim 12, Dakshina-Murthy discloses hydrocarbon compounds such as ethylene, propylene, methane and the like (col.5, line 48).

As claim 13, Dakshina-Murthy discloses inert ions may be introduced into the amorphous carbon layer (column 6, line 33). One of ordinary skill in the art

would also know that inert gases are conventionally used for diluting gases in plasma, which is a way of introducing inert ions during deposition.

As to claim 15, Dakshina-Murthy discloses an ARC layer (70) made of silicon nitride (column 7, line 12).

As to claim 17, Dakshina-Murthy shows all photoresist (88 and 90) is removed (figure 8) prior to etching conductive layer (50).

As claim 18, Dakshina-Murthy discloses "One advantageous feature of providing amorphous carbon layer 60 that may be produced with various thicknesses is that amorphous carbon layer 60 may be produced in a thickness suitable for patterning layer of conductive or semiconductive material 50. For example, where a particular thickness of polysilicon is provided, the thickness of amorphous carbon layer 60 may be altered so that the proper amount of mask material is provided over the polysilicon material to compensate for the etch selectivities of the materials used. This allows for increased manufacturing efficiency by eliminating unnecessary material use" (column 5, line 64) which means one of ordinary skill in the art could select the desired selectivity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakshina-Murthy et al. (US 6,884,733) in view of Godet, *Jounal of Applied Physics, Vol.84, 3919, (1998)* and Park et al. (US 2004/0224241) as applied to claim 11 above, in further view of Yang (Pub. No. 2003/0003771).

Dakshina-Murthy, Dakshina-Murthy fails to disclose a dual-frequency plasma for the PECVD deposition. However, Yang discloses a dual frequency that includes high frequency of 200 Watts at 13.56 MHz and a low frequency of 200 Watts and 500KHz (paragraph 0016). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to use the frequencies and power levels as described above because Yang illustrates the use proven deposition conditions disclosed in the literature in order to obtain a reliable product while reducing costly process development time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakshina-Murthy et al. (US 6,884,733) in view of Godet, *Jounal of Applied Physics, Vol.84, 3919, (1998)* and Park et al. (US 2004/0224241) as applied to claim 9, above Yang (US Pub. No. 2003/0003771).

Dakshina-Murthy fails to disclose a barrier layer. The reference of Yang cites it is conventional to deposit a barrier layer (136) prior to deposition of the conductive layer (page 5, paragraph 0057). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to add the step of depositing a barrier layer prior to deposition of the conductive layer because the reference of Yang teaches barrier layers are conventionally used. One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to use a barrier layer in order to prevent diffusion of the conductive material into the adjacent layer(s).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakshina-Murthy et al. (US 6,884,733) in view of Godet, *Jounal of Applied Physics, Vol.84, 3919, (1998)* and Park et al. (US 2004/0224241).

All the limitations in applicant's claim 19 have been addressed in reference to rejections of claims 1, 3-9, and 11-18 above, namely: a method for processing a substrate in a chamber, forming an aluminum-containing layer on a surface of the substrate depositing an amorphous carbon hardmask on the aluminum-containing layer by a method comprising: introducing into the processing chamber one or more hydrocarbon compounds having the general formula CxHy, wherein x has a ranqe of 2 to 4 and y has a range of 2 to 10 (see claim 1), and generating a plasma of the one or more hydrocarbon compounds by applying power from a dual-frequency RF source (see claim 1 above), depositing an anti-reflective coating on the amorphous carbon hardmask, wherein the anti-reflective coating is a material selected from the group of silicon nitride, silicon carbide, carbon-doped silicon oxide, amorphous carbon, and combinations thereof (see claims 8, 9), depositing a patterned resist material on the anti-reflective coating (see claim 9),etching the anti-reflective coating and amomhous carbon hardmask to the aluminum-containing layer (see claim 9

above);removing the resist material (see claim 17 above), etching feature definitions in the aluminum-containing layer at an etch selectivity of amorphous carbon to the aluminum-containing between about 1:3 and about 1:10 (see claim 18 above). As to the limitation of removing the one or more amorphous carbon layers by exposing the one or more amorphous carbon Layers to a plasma of a hydrogen-containing gas or an oxygen-containing gas, Dakshina-Murthy discloses "In a step 310, amorphous carbon features 62, 64 are removed after layer of conductive or semiconductive material 50 is patterned (e.g., to form gate conductors 30, 32 shown in FIG. 1). Amorphous carbon features 62, 64 may be removed using methods similar to those described above. For example, the amorphous carbon may be removed using an oxygen-containing plasma (column 8, line 63).

As to claim 20, Dakshina-Murthy discloses hydrocarbon compounds such ethelene, propylene, methane, and the like (col.5, line 48).

As claim 21, Dakshina-Murthy discloses inert ions may be introduced into the amorphous carbon layer (column 6, line 33). One of ordinary skill in the art would also know that inert gases are conventionally used for diluting gases in plasma, which is a way of introducing inert ions during deposition.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakshina-Murthy et al. (US 6,884,733), in view of Godet, *Jounal of Applied*

Physics, Vol.84, 3919, (1998) and Park et al. (US 2004/0224241) as applied to claim 19 above, in further view of Yang (Pub. No. 2003/0003771).

Dakshina-Murthy, Dakshina-Murthy fails to disclose a dual-frequency plasma for the PECVD deposition. However, Yang discloses a dual frequency that includes high frequency of 200 Watts at 13.56 MHz and a low frequency of 200 Watts and 500KHz (paragraph 0016). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the process of Dakshina-Murthy to use the frequencies and power levels as described above because Yang illustrates the use proven deposition conditions disclosed in the literature in order to obtain a reliable product while reducing costly process development time.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maki Angadi whose telephone number is (571)272-8213. The examiner can normally be reached on week days from 8:00 AM. to 5:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.

Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dr. Maki Angadi
Examiner
Art Unit 1765

NADINE G. NORTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER